

# 2006-2007 SES PRELIMINARY EVALUATION REPORT

## DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

**PROVIDER NAME:** Central Indiana Education Service Center (CIESC)

**DISTRICTS SERVED:** MSD Perry Township

**# OF STUDENTS SIGNED UP:** 30 (English/Language Arts and Mathematics)

## 2006-2007 EVALUATION GRADES (see report below for details)

**CUSTOMER SATISFACTION:** A

(How satisfied are districts, schools, and parents with the services that the provider offered)?

**SERVICE DELIVERY:** B+

(How well did the provider implement services, and to what extent did the provider implement its program with fidelity to its originally approved application)?

**ACADEMIC EFFECTIVENESS:** A

(Is the provider increasing the academic achievement of the students it served)?

## CUSTOMER SATISFACTION

### PARENT REPORT

% of parents reporting: 53%

Overall score: 3.8 out of 4.0

### DISTRICT REPORT

% of districts served reporting: 100%

District recommends continuation?: 100% of districts recommend continuation

### PRINCIPAL REPORT

% of principals reporting: 67%

Overall Score: 3.5 out of 4.0

**CUSTOMER SATISFACTION GRADE:** A

## SERVICE DELIVERY

### PARENT REPORT

% of parents reporting:	53%
Overall score:	3.7 out of 4.0

### DISTRICT REPORT:

% of districts reporting:	100%
Overall score:	89% (16/18 possible points)

### PRINCIPAL REPORT:

% of principals reporting:	67%
Overall score:	3.1 out of 4.0

<b>ONSITE MONITORING/COMPLIANCE:</b>	3.6 out of 4.0
--------------------------------------	----------------

Go to ([http://mustang.doe.state.in.us/dg/ses/pdf/OnSiteMonitor0607/CIESC\\_0607final.pdf](http://mustang.doe.state.in.us/dg/ses/pdf/OnSiteMonitor0607/CIESC_0607final.pdf)) to view the Onsite Monitoring Report from 2006-2007

**SERVICE DELIVERY GRADE:** **B+**

## ACADEMIC EFFECTIVENESS

<b>COMPLETION RATE:</b>	33%
<b>% OF STUDENTS MEETING GOALS</b>	91%
<b>TYPE OF ASSESSMENT USED BY PROVIDER:</b>	Reading 1 <sup>st</sup> /5 Easy Steps
<b>% OF STUDENTS SHOWING GAINS</b>	92%
<b>% OF STUDENTS WHO ATTENDED 80% OR MORE SESSIONS:</b> (Based on # attending 80% / # served who attended at least one session)	96.7%

In order to be included in the ISTEP+ analysis provided below, students must have completed 80% of their SES sessions, must not have been retained from 2006 to 2007, and must have ISTEP+ scores for both 2006 and 2007.

## ISTEP+ DATA (included in academic effectiveness grade):

### SES STUDENTS ONLY: ISTEP+ RESULTS

For students served by CIESC in 2006-2007, 88% made scale score gains on ISTEP+ in English/Language Arts, and 100% made scale score gains in Math, exceeding the statewide average for all SES students in both subjects. CIESC also exceeded the statewide average for all SES students showing one year's growth in both English/Language Arts (75%) and Math (100%). The percentage of students passing ISTEP+ stayed the same at 25% from 2006 to 2007 in English/Language Arts, but grew from 17% to 67% in Math.

Category	CIESC (E/LA)	All SES Students Statewide (E/LA)*	CIESC (Math)	All SES Students Statewide (Math)*
# of students	8	1675	12	1645
% showing growth on ISTEP+ scale score	88%	71%	100%	73%
% showing substantial (one year's) growth on ISTEP+ scale score**	75%	49%	100%	49%
% passing ISTEP+ (2006)	25%	43%	17%	52%
% passing ISTEP+ (2007)	25%	42%	67%	51%

\*Includes all students participating in SES who completed 80% of their sessions, were not retained from grades 2006-2007, and have ISTEP+ scores for 2006 and 2007.

\*\*Substantial growth (one year's growth) is defined as making a large enough scale score gain to pass ISTEP+ from one year to the next.

NOTE: For CIESC, English/Language Arts ISTEP+ data were not included in the ISTEP+ analysis portion of their academic effectiveness grade because fewer than 5 students could be matched with similar, non-participating students. Data are reported for E/LA in this chart for CIESC for informational purposes only.

### SES AND NON-SES STUDENTS MATCHED: ISTEP+ RESULTS

When possible, each student who participated in SES, completed 80% of his or her sessions, and had ISTEP+ scores for both 2006 and 2007 was matched with a similar student who was eligible for but did not participate in SES. SES students were matched with other students from their school on a number of characteristics, including grade in school, race, free/reduced lunch eligibility, special education status, limited English proficiency, and 2006 ISTEP+ scale score. The charts below provide the results of the matched comparison. The matched comparison provides a context in which to place the gains or losses made by SES students. By looking at the charts below, it can be determined whether students served by this SES provider performed about the same as similar students who did not participate in SES; worse than similar students who did not participate in SES; or better than similar students who did not participate in SES. For CIESC, 6 matches out of 12 participating students (50%) were made for Math, and 3 matches out of 8 participating students (38%) were made for English/Language Arts. As noted above, because fewer than 5 students could be matched for English/Language Arts, these students were not included in the data analysis for generating the ISTEP+ portion of the academic effectiveness grade.

MATHEMATICS						
	# Matched	% Matched	% showing growth	% showing 1 year's growth	Average growth	% passing (2007)
SES	6	50%	100%	100%	102.3	100%
Not SES			100%	100%	59.3	50%

As shown in the chart above, 100% of the both the SES students and the similar, non-participating students included in the matched comparison showed any growth on ISTEP+ scale score. 100% of each group also showed substantial (one year's) growth. However, 100% of the SES students in the comparison passed ISTEP+ in 2007, compared to 50% of the similar, non-participating students. When examining these differences and similarities, it is important to note that the sample is small (6).

Note that information provided in the ISTEP+ analysis represents descriptive statistics only (averages and percentages). Additional statistical analyses, including results disaggregated by district and grade level, will be conducted in the statewide evaluation of SES 2006-2007, to be released by the fall of 2008.

**ACADEMIC EFFECTIVENESS GRADE:      A**

**OVERALL GRADE:      A**